

REMARKS

Initially, Applicants note that the Information Disclosure Statement filed January 17, 2001 has been acknowledged, but a copy of the PTO-1449 form appropriately initialed indicating consideration of the cited prior art was not attached to the Office Action. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to provide the PTO-1449 when an subsequent Office Action is issued.

At the time of the Office Action dated April 13, 2004, claims 1-25 were pending. Applicants acknowledge, with appreciation, the Examiner's allowance of claims 11-21. Applicants also acknowledge, with appreciation, the Examiner's indication that claims 2-6 and 23-25 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 1, 7-10 and 22 stand rejected.

In this Amendment, claims 2, 4-11, 13-20, 23 and 25 have been amended, and claims 1 and 22 have been canceled. Care has been exercised to avoid the introduction of new matter. Specifically, allowable claims 2, 5 and 6 have been amended to be in independent form based on claim 1. Claims 7-10 have been amended to be dependent on claim 2. Allowable claim 23 has also been amended to be in independent form based on claim 22. In addition, claims 4, 11, 13-20 and 25 have been amended only for better form but their scopes are not narrowed for any reason regarding patentability.

In the Office Action, the Examiner pointed out that "The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title," and "It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, 'The disclosure concerns,' 'The disclosure defined by this invention,' 'The disclosure describes,' etc." (paragraph 1 of the Office Action). In

response, Applicants have amended the abstract, as attached, to obviate the issues pointed out by the Examiner. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objections to the abstract is respectfully solicited.

The Examiner also advised that the term “digital” should be inserted before “broadcasting” in claim 22. It is noted that claim 22 has been canceled, and for that reason, the objections of claims 22-25 have been rendered moot.

Claims 1, 7, 9-10 and 22 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Takeuchi in view of Taura et al.; and claim 8 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Takeuchi in view of Taura et al., and further in view of Sakamoto. It is noted that these rejections have been rendered moot by cancellation of claims 1 and 22, and amendment of claims 7-10 to be dependent on allowable claim 2, respectively. Applicants, therefore, respectfully solicit withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 7, 9-10 and 22.

Accordingly, it is urged that the application is in condition for allowance, an indication of which is respectfully solicited. If there are any outstanding issues that might be resolved by an interview or an Examiner’s amendment, Examiner is requested to call Applicants’ attorney at the telephone number shown below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

MCDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP



Tomoki Tanida

Recognition under 37 C.F.R. 10.9(b)

600 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005-3096
(202) 756-8000 SAB:TT:lnm
Facsimile: (202) 756-8087
Date: July 12, 2004